

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 as being anticipated by Hughes, claims 5-6 as being unpatentable over Hughs in view of well known features of using computer program product stored on a computer readable medium and claims 7-15 presumably over Hughes for similar reasons (the Examiner failed to mention under which clause claims 7-15 are rejected). However, Applicant's submit that the Examiner's reasons for these rejections are actually in error and reconsideration in view of the foregoing arguments is requested.

First, it should be noted that, in the automatic information filtering method of claim 1, whether the URL of the entered HTML information is a top page URL or not is judged first. If it is a top page URL, words appearing in the information indicated by that top page URL (i.e., not that URL itself but the information provided at that URL) are extracted and the automatic filtering to judge whether this information is inappropriate or not is carried out. If it is judged as inappropriate, an upper level URL derived from that top page URL is registered into an inappropriate upper level URL list and the presentation of the information indicated by that top page URL is blocked. On the other hand, if the URL of the entered HTML information is not a top page URL, this URL is compared with each URL registered in the inappropriate upper level URL list, and if there is a matching URL in the inappropriate upper level URL list, the presentation of information indicated by this URL blocked, whereas if there is no matching URL in the inappropriate upper level URL list, words appearing in the information indicated by that URL (i.e., not that URL itself but the information provided at that URL) are extracted and the automatic filtering to judge whether this information is inappropriate or not is carried out. Then,

if it is judged as inappropriate, the presentation of the information indicated by that URL is blocked.

In other words, when the URL of the entered HTML information is either a top page URL or a non-top page URL with no matching URL registered in the inappropriate upper level URL list, the automatic filtering according to words extracted from the information indicated by that URL is carried out to determine whether the presentation of the information indicated by that URL should be blocked or not. On the other hand, when the URL of the entered HTML information is a non-top page URL of the entered HTML information is a non-top page URL with a matching URL registered in the inappropriate upper level URL list, the presentation of the information indicated by the URL is immediately blocked without carrying out the automatic filtering. Here, the upper level URLs registered in the inappropriate upper level URL list are derived from the top page URLs whose information was found inappropriate in the past. In this way, it becomes possible to judge the inappropriateness of the HTML information accurately even in the case of an almost textless page in which only images are presented (see page 26, line 14 to page 27, line 8 and Fig. 6 of the present specification).

In contrast, Hughes completely fails to disclose any teaching for the use of the upper level URL derived from the top page URLs indicating inappropriate information, or the use of the automatic filtering based on words extracted from the information (page) indicated by the URL. Hughes only describes an undesirable content filtering using the primary filtering list and the URL keyword search, i.e., a detection of a prescribed word in the URL itself.

In fact, the quoted portions of Hughes, i.e. Abstract col. 2 line 30 to col 5, line 21, col. 8, line 8 to col. 9, line 34, and col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 64, do not even mention any derivation of an upper level URL from the top page URL or a list of such upper level URL, as well as any extraction of words from the information (page) indicated by the URL or the automatic filtering using such extracted words.

Thus Hughes clearly does not anticipate claim 1, and the Examiner's rejection based on Hughes is flawed.

The same argument also applies to the dependent claim 2, as well as corresponding apparatus claim 3 and 4 and corresponding medium claims 5 and 6.

Next, it should be noted that, in the automatic information filtering method of claim 7, the automatic learning using learning data containing both inappropriate information and appropriate information is carried out to obtain the word weights of words, and these word weights are stored and managed in correspondence to respective words. Then, the words contained in the entered information (page) are extracted and a total sum of the word weights of these extracted words is calculated, and whether the presentation of the entered information should be blocked or not is judged according to the calculated total sum of the words weights.

In contrast, Hughes fails to disclose any teaching for the use of the word weights obtained by the automatic learning, or the use of the total sum of the words weights of the words extracted from the entered information (page) in judging the presentation of the entered information. As already mentioned above, Hughes only describes an undesirable content filtering using the URL keyword search, i.e., a detection of a prescribed word in the URL itself.

In fact, the quoted portions of Hughes, i.e., col. 10, line 40 to col. 12, line 17 and col. 4, lines 50-67, do not even mention any learning of word weights or any use of such word weights or any use of such words weights in judging the presentation of the entered information.

Clearly, Hughes does not anticipate claim 7, and the Examiner's rejection based on Hughes is in error.


The same argument also applies to the dependent claims 8 and 9, as well as corresponding apparatus claims 10-12 and corresponding medium claims 13-15.

In conclusion, Hughes neither anticipates or suggests the invention defined in claims 1-15. Neither Section 102 or Section 103 is applicable, for the reasons stated above. The claims 1-15 standing in this application are patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

The present application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: September 2, 2003

By: 
Seymour Rothstein
(Reg. No. 19,369)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.
20 North Wacker Drive
36th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 580-1180

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper and its attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 2, 2003.


Seymour Rothstein